

REMARKS

Please cancel Claims 11-12 and 14 without prejudice. Claims 1-2, 7-10, 15-18 and 23-26 are pending. Claims 1-2, 9-10, 15 and 17-18 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments.

Specification

The instant Office Action refers to the use of the trademark "Bluetooth" in the instant application. On page 2 of the instant Office Action, the Examiner states that the response filed on February 22, 2006, is missing the changes made to capitalize the term "Bluetooth." The specification was amended to capitalize the term "Bluetooth" in the Office Action response submitted on June 27, 2005 – the response preceding the response filed on February 22, 2006. Because the required amendments have already been submitted, they were not duplicated in the prior response and are not duplicated in this response.

103 Rejections

Claims 1-2, 9-10, 17-18 and 25-26

The instant Office Action states that Claims 1-2, 9-10, 17-18 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suomela (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0011467) in view of Yoshizawa (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0036273). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-2, 9-10, 17-18 and 25-26 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Suomela and Yoshizawa, alone or in combination.

In essence, embodiments in accordance with the present claimed invention include at least the following claimed features: i) a “trusted device” (which is defined by the claims) is distinguished from non-trusted devices in a list of devices within wireless range; and ii) a user can make a choice as to whether or not a device should be designated as a trusted device.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither the cited portions of Suomela, nor Suomela in its entirety, show or suggest these claimed features. The database 230 of Suomela includes a listing of accessible devices, sorted by user. However, the database 230 makes no distinction between trusted devices and non-trusted devices. That is, if the database 230 is read as listing both trusted and non-trusted devices, then there is no teaching in Suomela that the trusted and non-trusted devices in the listing are somehow distinguishable from each other, in contrast to the claimed invention. According to paragraph 0051 of Suomela, “only the ubiquitous devices that the requesting user is authorized to access are displayed on the map” (emphasis added) – quite clearly, Suomela displays only one type of device (either trusted devices or non-trusted devices, but not both). On page 2 of the instant Office Action (“Response to Arguments”), the Examiner apparently agrees that Suomela displays only one type of device, but not both types of devices.

Applicants further submit that Yoshizawa does not overcome the shortcomings of Suomela. Yoshizawa does not appear to describe displaying a list of any type.

Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Suomela and Yoshizawa, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest “designating said device as a trusted device ...; and indicating that said device is a trusted device in said list, wherein said list

includes trusted devices and non-trusted devices and wherein in said list said trusted devices are distinguished from said non-trusted devices” as recited in independent Claim 1 and as similarly recited in independent Claims 9 and 17. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicants also respectfully submit that Suomela and Yoshizawa, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 2 and 25 dependent on Claim 1, Claim 10 dependent on Claim 9, and Claims 18 and 26 dependent on Claim 17, and that Claims 2, 10, 18 and 25-26 are in condition for allowance as being dependent on allowable base claims.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 1-2, 9-10, 17-18 and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Claims 7, 15 and 23

The instant Office Action states that Claims 7, 15 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suomela in view of Yoshizawa and further in view of Baptist et al. (“Baptist;” U.S. Patent No. 5,465,392). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 7, 15 and 23 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Suomela, Yoshizawa and Baptist, alone or in combination.

Claims 7, 15 and 23 are dependent on independent Claims 1, 9 and 17, respectively, and recite additional limitations. As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Suomela and Yoshizawa, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 9 and 17.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Baptist does not overcome the shortcomings of Suomela and Yoshizawa. Baptist does not appear to describe displaying a list of any type.

Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Baptist, alone or in combination with Suomela and Yoshizawa, does not show or suggest “designating said device as a trusted device ...; and indicating that said device is a trusted device in said list, wherein said list includes trusted devices and non-trusted devices and wherein in said list said trusted devices are distinguished from said non-trusted devices” as recited in independent Claim 1 and as similarly recited in independent Claims 9 and 17.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 9 and 17 are not shown or suggested by Suomela, Yoshizawa and Baptist, alone or in combination. As such, Applicants further submit that Claims 7, 15 and 23 are also not shown by Suomela, Yoshizawa and Baptist, alone or in combination, because Claims 7, 15 and 23 depend on Claim 1, 9 or 17 and recite additional limitations.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 7, 15 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Claims 8, 16 and 24

The instant Office Action states that Claims 8, 16 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suomela in view of Yoshizawa and further in view of Sormunen et al. (“Sormunen,” U.S. Patent No. 6,112,078). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention

as recited in Claims 8, 16 and 24 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Suomela, Yoshizawa and Sormunen, alone or in combination.

Claims 8, 16 and 24 are dependent on independent Claims 1, 9 and 17, respectively, and recite additional limitations. As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Suomela and Yoshizawa, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 9 and 17.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Sormunen does not overcome the shortcomings of Suomela and Yoshizawa. Sormunen does not appear to describe displaying a list of any type.

Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Sormunen, alone or in combination with Suomela and Yoshizawa, does not show or suggest "designating said device as a trusted device ...; and indicating that said device is a trusted device in said list, wherein said list includes trusted devices and non-trusted devices and wherein in said list said trusted devices are distinguished from said non-trusted devices" as recited in independent Claim 1 and as similarly recited in independent Claims 9 and 17.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 9 and 17 are not shown or suggested by Suomela, Yoshizawa and Sormunen, alone or in combination. As such, Applicants further submit that Claims 8, 16 and 24 are also not shown by Suomela, Yoshizawa and Sormunen, alone or in combination, because Claims 8, 16 and 24 depend on Claim 1, 9 or 17 and recite additional limitations.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 8, 16 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-2, 7-10, 15-18 and 23-26 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



William A. Zarbis
Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060

Date: 9/28/06